



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,748	11/25/2003	Yasuhiba Fukui	49618DIV(71965)	3389
7590	07/16/2008		EXAMINER	
Peter F. Corless EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP P.O. Box 55874 Boston, MA 02205			GRUN, JAMES LESLIE	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	1641			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
07/16/2008	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/723,748	Applicant(s) FUKUI ET AL.
	Examiner JAMES L. GRUN	Art Unit 1641

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 April 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 21-32 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 21-32 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/518,737.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/146/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

The amendment filed 16 April 2008 is acknowledged and has been entered.

Claims 21-32 are newly added. Claims 1-20 have been cancelled. Claims 21-32 remain in the case.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to provide an adequate written description of the invention, and failing to adequately teach how to make and/or use the invention, i.e. failing to provide an enabling disclosure.

Claims 21-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for reasons similar to those of record as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention, and which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

As set forth, applicant defines and exemplifies specificity of an antibody to phosphatidylinositol-3,4-bisphosphate as that which can distinguish phosphatidylinositol-3,4-bisphosphate from other phosphorylated compounds. The examiner would also note that the compounds recited on page 8 of the specification are not recited in the alternative and there

would, therefore, be no support for an antibody which is specific for phosphatidylinositol-3,4-bisphosphate and which is non-cross-reactive only with one compound from the list rather than non-cross-reactive with all of the listed compounds as disclosed. Thus, it would seem that an antibody which does not substantially cross-react with only one of the compounds listed in the specification, as instantly claimed, would not be, given applicant's definition, specific for phosphatidylinositol-3,4-bisphosphate.

As set forth, inter alia, in the absence of any guidance other than to the use of the antibodies produced by the hybridoma cell line deposited as FERM-BP-6849, one would not know or be able to predict or envision what other variable region structure or variable region changes would predictably function in the invention other than those possessing both the intact V_H and V_L chains of the 8C2-FNL antibody. As set forth, adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that a product is part of the invention, more than a reference to a potential method of isolating it even if the method is simple, and more than a generic statement which defines a genus of products by only their functional activity. As set forth, the product itself is required as well as recitation of a representative number of products falling within the scope of a claimed genus. Moreover, as set forth, all possible analogs of a product are not enabled by a disclosure wherein the characteristics of the analogs are unpredictable. In this regard, there is nothing in evidence that an antibody analog even of the 8C2-FNL antibody having a "variable region thereof" such as a single CDR of the 8C2-FNL antibody, or all of the CDRs only of the V_H chain, or all of the CDRs only of the V_L chain by themselves, rather than having both the intact V_H and V_L chains, are sufficient for the antibody possessing same to

predictably have the antigen binding specificity of the 8C2-FNL antibody and predictably function in the invention.

Applicant's arguments filed 16 April 2008 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Notwithstanding applicant's assertions to the contrary, applicant's amendments have not obviated rejections under this statute for the reasons set forth above.

Claims 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while describing and being enabling for competitive assay with a sample solution and determining phosphatidylinositol-3,4-bisphosphate in the sample solution by comparison to marker measured with standard solutions (see e.g. page 15), does not reasonably provide enablement for the invention as instantly claimed wherein merely a test sample is used and comparisons to blanks and some lesser amount are made. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Absent further written description and guidance from applicant, one would not be assured of the ability to practice the method in the absence of a sample solution or in the absence of a standard containing phosphatidylinositol-3,4-bisphosphate.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 21-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 21, at line 2, it is believed that --phosphatidylinositol-- was intended. In this claim, “the” presence or absence lacks antecedent basis.

In claim 27, recitations of “the” amount or lesser amount lack antecedent basis.

In claim 30, recitations of “the” amount or lesser amount or quantity lack antecedent basis.

In claims 26, 29, and 32, “the” hybridoma cell line lacks antecedent basis.

Applicant's arguments filed 16 April 2008 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Notwithstanding applicant's assertions to the contrary, applicant's amendments have not obviated rejections under this statute for the reasons set forth above.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE **THREE MONTHS** FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST REPLY IS FILED WITHIN **TWO MONTHS** OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE **THREE-MONTH** SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN

Art Unit: 1641

THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY EXPIRE LATER THAN **SIX MONTHS** FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James L. Grun, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0821. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 11 a.m. to 7 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le, SPE, can be contacted at (571) 272-0823.

The phone number for official facsimile transmitted communications to TC 1600, Group 1640, is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application, or requests to supply missing elements from Office communications, should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/J. L. G./
James L. Grun, Ph.D.
Examiner, Art Unit 1641
July 16, 2008

/Long V Le/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1641